

The 21st October, 1994

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./676.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of the Secretary, to Government, Haryana, PWD (B & R) Deptt., Chandigarh *versus* Abbas Ali :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. R. BANSAL (ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE),  
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Reference No. 132 of 1993

WORKMAN SHRI ABBAS ALI, S/O SHRI KESHO DEEN, VILLAGE JATTON  
WALA, P.O. DAR PUR, TEH. CHHACHHRAULI, DISTT. YAMUNA NAGAR

and

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SECRETARY, TO GOVT., HARYANA, DEPTT. OF  
PWD (PUBLIC HEALTH) CIVIL SEC., CHANDIGARH, (ii) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,  
PWD (PUBLIC HEALTH) DIVISION NO. 1. YAMUNA NAGAR, (iii) SUB-  
DIVISIONAL ENGINEER, SUB-DIVISION NO. 2. PWD (PUBLIC  
HEALTH), YAMUNA NAGAR

Present :

Workman in person.

Shri Jagmal Singh, ADA with Shri V. M. Handa, Xen.

## AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (for short called as the 'Act') the Governor of Haryana has referred the following dispute, between Abbas Ali and the management The Secretary to Govt., Haryana, Deptt. of PWD (Public Health) Civil Sec., Chandigarh etc. to this court for adjudication,—vide Haryana Govt. notification No 33986-92, dated 6th September, 1993 :—

Whether the termination of services of Abbas Ali is valid & justified ? If not,, to what relief is he entitled ?

Today the case is fixed for workman's evidence. The parties have settled the dispute and made the following statement :—

बयान श्री अब्बास अली सन आफ केशो दीन, उम्र 22

मेरा प्रबन्धकों के साथ समझौता हो गया है। समझौता इस शर्त पर हुआ है कि प्रबन्धक मुझे नौकरी पद पिछली सविस् को जारी रखते हुए बिना पिछले वेतन के नौकरी पर रखने के लिए तैयार है।

बयान श्री वी एम. हान्डा, अक्सीयन, पी डब्ल्यू डी, पब्लिक हेल्थ, यमुना नगर, डि० नं० 2, ग्रान एस ऐ

मैंने उपरोक्त बयान सुन लिया है जो कि दस्त है श्रमिक को पिछली सविस् को जारी रखते हुए बिना पिछले वेतन के ड्यूटी पर लेने के लिए तैयार है। श्रमिक अपनी ड्यूटी 15 दिन के अन्दर-अन्दर ज्वाइन कर सकता है। इस बिना पर इस केस का फैसला कर दिया जावे।

In view of the above statements, the reference shall stand answered to the effect that the workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service but without back wages.

S. R. BANSAL,

The 13th September, 1994.

Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

Endst. No. 1583, dated the 21st September, 1994.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner & Secretary to Govt., Haryana, Labour & Employment Depts., Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. R. BANSAL,

(Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge),  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

No. 14/13/87-6 Lab./679.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hydrolics India, 153, Industrial Area, Panchkula *versus* Shyam Sunder :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. R. BANSAL (ADDL. DISTT. AND SESSIONS JUDGE),  
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA.

Reference No. 71 of 1992

WORKMAN SHRI SHYAM SUNDER THROUGH HOUSE NO. 118-A,  
SECTOR 30-B, CHANDIGARH

and

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HYDROLICS INDIA, 153, INDUSTRIAL AREA,  
PHASE-I, PANCHKULA

Present :

Workman in person.

Shri Suraj Negi, Clerk of Shri R. L. Chopra.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short called as the 'Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Shyam Sunder and the management of M/s Hydrolics India, 153, Industrial Area, Phase 1, Panchkula to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Govt. notification bearing No. 17556—61, dated 2nd April, 1992 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shyam Sunder is valid and justified? If not so, to what relief is he entitled?

The workman appeared and submitted his claim statement. The management appeared and resisted the claim of the workman.

Today the parties appeared and the workman in his statement made has stated as follows:—

व्याप्त श्याम सुन्दर, पुत्र राजा राम, उमर 35 साल, पेशा फोरमैन साकत, पडना वर्कमेंट सह शपथ

व्याप्त किया कि मेरा प्रबन्धकों से राजीनामा हो गया है मैंने मुकलिय 10,000 रुपये प्रबन्धकों से अपनी पिछले वेतन के ऐवज से, फुल एंड फाईनल सेटलमेंट में वसूल पा लिए हैं। प्रबन्धक मुझे तोकरी पर वापस लेने के लिए राजामन्द हो गए हैं। मेरा फैसला किया जावे राजीनामा अतल जाया हुं एम्प्लीबोड उन्सकी फोटो कापी है। इस पर मेरे दस्तखत है। व जे.के. गुप्ता, मानक प्रतिवादी के दस्तखत है। यह दस्तखत है मेरा फैसला किया जावे।

The representative of the management made the following statement: —

ब्यान सुरज नेगी, प्रतिनिधी प्रबन्धक

ब्यान वाला सुन लिया है। दहसत व तस्लीम है।

In view of the statement made, the workman is ordered to be reinstated. There will be no order as to continuity of service or back wages as the workman has already received a sum of Rs 10,000 in full and final settlement of his claim with regard to back wages. Parties shall be bound by the terms of settlement deed Ex. W-I which shall form part of the Award.

The reference stand answered accordingly.

S. R. BANSAL,

The 26th September, 1994.

Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

Endst. No. 1614, dated the 27th September, 1994.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Govt. of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. R. BANSAL,

Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./687.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s M.D. Ambala Central Coop. Bank Ltd., Ambala City *versus* Jagmal Singh:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. R. BANSAL (ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE),  
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Reference No. 132 of 1988

WORKMAN SHRI JAGMAL SINGH, THROUGH SHRI MADHU SUDAN SARAN  
KAUSHISH PHMARAN STREET, JAGADHRI AND THE MANAGEMENT  
(1)MANAGING DIRECTOR, THE AMBALA CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE  
BANK LTD., AMBALA CITY AND (2) YAMUNA NAGAR  
CENTRAL CO-OP. BANK LTD., YAMUNA NAGAR.

*Present :*

WR. Shri Madhu Sudan.

MR. Shri Subhash Tyagi.

#### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section 1 of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short called as the 'Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Jagmal Singh and the Ambala Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Ambala City to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government notification bearing No. 20734—38, dated the 12th May, 1988 :—

“Whether the termination the services of Shri Jagmal Singh is valid and justified. If not, so to what relief is he entitled?”

The workman raised an industrial dispute by serving a demand notice dated 19th February, 1988. The conciliation proceedings were taken up by Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer. The same having failed the appropriate Government made the above mentioned reference.

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the workman as well as to the management. The workman appeared and stated that his demand notice may be treated as his claim statement.

The stand of the workman is that he was appointed as Secretary in Bhatauli Coop. Society. Ltd. Bhatauli on 30th December, 1982 and his services were terminated on 30th October, 1983 although he had rendered more than 240 days of service continuously in a calendar year. The workman alleged that his termination is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of section 25-H and section 25-F of the Act. He demanded his reinstatement with continuity of service and back period wages.

The management appeared and resisted the claim of the workman. It was alleged that the services of the workman were terminated in accordance with the terms and conditions of the appointment letter and the workman having raised the dispute after a lapse of more than 4 1/2 years. The claim is belated and time barred. Other allegations were denied.

The workman submitted replication controverting the allegations of the management in the written statement filed and reiterating those made in the claim statement/demand notice.

On the rival contentions of the parties, the following points in issues were settled for decision:—

- (1) Whether the impugned termination of services of workman was invalid ? OPW
- (2) Relief.

During the pendency of the proceedings the management bifurcated on 1st October, 1993 due to the creation of Yamuna Nagar Central Coop. Bank Ltd. Yamuna Nagar and this court,—vide order dated 1st March, 1994 allowed the application moved by the said bank and impleaded it as respondent No. 2 in the case.

I have heard the representatives of the parties. My issuewise findings are as under:—

#### Issue No. 1 :

The workman appeared as WW-I and stated that he was appointed as Secretary on 30th December, 1982 and his services were terminated on 3rd October, 1983 without any chargesheet, notice or payment of retrenchment compensation. He also stated that his juniors were retained in service. The management in rebuttal produced MW-I Nirmaljit Singh, clerk who stated that the workman was appointed as Secretary for 89 days on 30th December, 1982 and his appointment was renewed on 2nd April, 1983 and again on 5th July, 1983 for 89 days each. He lastly stated that the services of the workman were terminated in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment letter. The witness did not dispute that the workman rendered 240 days of service continuously in a period preceding twelve months. It is an admitted fact that no chargesheet was served. Similarly no prior notice was given nor retrenchment compensation was paid. The action of the management in terminating the services of the workman is, thus, patently illegal and the management can not take shelter under the plea that the services of the workman were terminated in accordance with the terms and conditions of the appointment letter. Moreover the fact the juniors namely Arun Kumar, Ram Lal were retained has not been disputed. In such a situation the workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service. The workman is, however, not entitled to back wages as he himself gave up his claim of back wages,—vide his statement made on 20th October, 1993.

#### Relief

The workman is held entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service but without back wages.

The reference stands answered accordingly.

An intimation be sent to all the quarters concerned.

S. R. BANSAL,

The 17th August, 1994.

Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

Endorsement No. 1563, dated the 21st September, 1994.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. R. BANSAL,

Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala.

The 21st October, 1994

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./690.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Raja Forging Ltd. (U.T.), Mani Majra, Chandigarh. *versus* Jagdish Singh.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. R. BANSAL, (ADDL. DISTT. & SESSIONS JUDGE) PRESIDING  
OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Reference No. 87 of 93

*between*

WORKMAN SHRI JAGDISH SINGH SON OF SHRI MAST RAM, VILLAGE KUNDI,  
POST OFFICE PANCHKULA, DISTT. AMBALA.

*and*

THE MANAGEMENT (1) RAJA FORGING LTD. S. C. O. 860, U. T., MANIMAJRA, CHANDIGARH  
AND (2) RAJA FORGING LTD. 226-227, INDUSTRIAL AREA, PANCHKULA.

*Present :*

workman, in person.

M R. Shri Deepak Arora.

#### AWARD

The Government of Haryana Labour Department has made the following reference to this court for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jagdish Singh is valid and justified. If not, to what relief, is he entitled ?

The workman appeared and filed the claim statement. The management filed written statement to the claim statement on the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed :—

- 1 Whether the termination of services of Jagdish Singh, workman is illegal and invalid as alleged ? OPW
- 2 Whether the workman has abandoned the job voluntarily as alleged ? If so, to what effect ? OPM
- 3 Relief.

Today the case was posted for recording the workman's evidence. The workman made the following statement.

म्यां जगदीश सिंह पुत्र मस्त राम, उमर 30 साल, पेशा बेकार साकन कुण्डी सह मपन :

म्यां क्रिया कि प्रबन्धको ने मुझे नौकरी पर बहाल कर किया है और नया नियुक्ति पत्र अदालत में अभी दे दिया है, मैं पिछला बेतन मन कर ठीक माना ।

The representative of the management also made the following statement :-

Jagdish Singh *versus* M/s Raja Forging.

Statement of Shri Deepak Arora, MR. W/O

मैंने ब्यान बाला सुन लिया है दुस्त व तसलीम है। फैसला किया जावे।

In view of the statements made, the workman is ordered to be reinstated against the fresh appointment accepted by him in the court who has given up his claim for continuity of service and back wages. The statements of the parties shall form part of this award for which the parties shall be bound.

The reference shall stand answered accordingly.

Dated : The 19th September, 1994

S. R. BANSAL,

Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala.

Endorsement No. 1591, dated the 21st September, 1994.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. R. BANSAL,

Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala.

The 21st October, 1994

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./694.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Engineer-in-Chief, P. W. D. (B & R), Haryana Chandigarh, *versus* Maan Singh.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. R. BANSAL, (ADDL. DISTT. & SESSIONS JUDGE),  
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Reference No. 291 of 1991

SHRI MAAN SINGH, S/O SHRI CHAMELLA RAM, C/O DR. SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA, TRADE UNION OFFICE, DHARAMSHALA BRAHAMAN, BAWNA ROAD, JAGADHRI

and

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF, P.W.D. (B & R), HARYANA, CHANDIGARH ; (ii) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, P.W.D. (B & R) NEAR BUS STAND, YAMUNA NAGAR

Present :

None for workman.

Mr. Shri Jagmal Singh, ADA.

#### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short called as the 'Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Maan Singh and the management of the Engineer-in-Chief, P.W.D. (B & R)

Haryana, Chandigarh, (ii) Executive Engineer, P.W.D. (B & R) Near Bus Stand, Yamuna Nagar to this Court for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government notification bearing No. 43571-76, dated 18th December, 1991 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Maan Singh, workman is justified and valid ? If not so, to what relief is he entitled ?

The workman served a demand notice dated 20th August, 1991 under section 2 (A) of the Act upon the management. The conciliation proceedings were taken up by the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer. The same having failed, the appropriate Government made the above mentioned reference to this court.

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the workman as well as to the management. The workman appeared and stated that his demand notice may be treated as claim statement. The management filed written statement to the demand notice/claim statement. On a subsequent date i.e. 15th April, 1994, Shri Surinder Sharma, authorised representative of the workman appeared and pleaded no instructions from the workman. The workman also did not appear in this court. Accordingly *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against the workman and the management was called upon to lead *ex parte* evidence. Today when the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management, the authorised representative of the management also closed its evidence.

There is no evidence to substantiate the allegations of the workman as contained in demand notice, this reference is bound to be answered against him. I order accordingly.

The reference shall stand answered accordingly.

S. R. BANSAL,

The 11th August, 1994

Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

Endorsement No. 1565, dated the 21st September, 1994.

Forwarded, (four copies) to the Finance Commissioner & Secretary to Govt. Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. R. BANSAL,

Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,  
Ambala.

No. 14/13/87-6-Lab./700.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of the Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s M. D. HSMITC, Chandigarh *versus* Yash Pal Singh.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. R. BANSAL, ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,  
PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA.

Reference No. 333 of 88

WORKMAN SHRI YASH PAL SINGH, SON OF SHRI SUMER SINGH, V.P.O. MARWA, KHURD, VIA BILASPUR (AMBALA) AND MANAGEMENT (1) MANAGING DIRECTOR H.S.M.I.T.C., CHANDIGARH, (2) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, H. S. M. I. T. C. DIVISION NO. 1, SAINI SAMAJ BHAWAN, KURUKSHETRA.

Present :—

WR. Shri J. R. Sharma.

MR. Shri U. Kant.

#### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section 1 of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short called as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Yash Pal Singh and the management (1) Managing Director, H.S.M.I.T.C., Chandigarh; (2) Executive Engineer, H.S.M.I.T.C Division No. 1, Saini Samaj Bhawan, Kurukshetra to this court for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government notification bearing No. 34303-308, dated 26th July, 1988 :—

"Whether the termination of the services of Shri Yash Pal Singh is valid and justified ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

On receipt of the reference notice were issued to the workman as well as to the management. The workman appeared and made a statement that his demand notice may be treated as his claim statement. The management filed his written statement to the claim statement/demand notice.

The workman submitted his replication controverting the allegations of the written statement filed and reiterated those made in the claim statement/demand notice.

On the rival contentions of the parties the following issues were framed for decision :

- (1) Whether the impugned termination of services of the workman is invalid ? OPW
- (2) Whether the application is not covered by the provision of Industrial Disputes Act ? OPR
- (3) Whether the applicant has no *locus-standi* alleged in preliminary objection No. 6 of the WS ? OPM
- (4) Relief.

Parties led their evidence. I have heard the representatives of the parties. My findings are as under :—

#### Issue No. 1

The workman examined himself as WW-1 and closed the evidence. The management examined MW-1 Shri J.P. Gupta, Xen and MW-2 Shri K.S. Babbar, S.D.O., M.I.T.C., Karnal and also closed the evidence thereafter. As deposed by MW-1 he was appointed as T/Mate with the respondent management at Munak on 26th February, 1985 and his services were terminated on 1st April, 1986 any chargesheet and without payment of any compensation under the Act. He further stated that he was unemployed and was not having any resources to maintain himself. In his cross-examination, he however admitted that he was again appointed after his termination before the expiry of 240 days w.o.f. 15th October, 1985 and continued to work upto 1st April, 1986. The respondent-management in the statement of MW-1 Shri J.P. Gupta somehow brought on record that the workman has only worked for 137 days, as according to them there was no sanction for his continuance after 28th February, 1986. It was admitted in the cross-examination of this witness that no letter of termination was given to the workman and the workman used to mark his own presence in the attendance register. The original attendance register was somehow not available, as it was alleged that the workman had stolen the same from the office, for which a criminal case was got registered by the management. Mark-I to U are the photostat copies of attendance register which can obviously not be read into evidence in the absence of the original record. The workman has also not been placed on record the letter of his appointment with a view to see as to which date he had joined the service of the respondent-management. The representative of the workman somehow argued that workman had worked for 362 days. Somehow no record has been made available to prove this fact. The representative of the management in any case argued that the workman was appointed on 19th February, 1985 and he worked upto 6th September, 1985. According to him he was again appointed on 15th October, 1985 and he worked upto 29th February, 1986. If this argument of the learned representative of the management is taken into correct, in that case the workman has worked during the preceding twelve months for nearly a period of 338 days. Evidently, in this way, the workman has worked with the respondent-management for a minimum period of 240 days as rightly alleged by him in his demand notice. The respondent-management has not showed the reason for termination of the services of workman. There is nothing on record to show that the services of the workman were dispensed with on the basis of any stigma against him. The workman was not issued with any chargesheet and no enquiry was held against him and under such circumstances his services could evidently be not terminated except by following the provisions of law. The workman was not issued with any notice and no retrenchment compensation was paid by the respondent-management while terminating his services. In the situation, the impugned termination of the services of the workman is held to be illegal and contrary to the provisions to the Act. This issue is accordingly decided in favour of the workman and against the management.

#### Issue No. 2 and 3

Both these issues were not pressed and hence they need no specific finding.



**Relief.**

In view of the finding on issue No. 1, the workman is held entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and back period wages.

The reference stands answered accordingly.

An intimation be sent to all the quarters concerned.

The 23rd August, 1994.

S. R. Bansal,  
Additional District & Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala.

Endorsement No. 1567, dated the 21st September, 1994

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. R. Bansal,  
Additional District & Sessions Judge,  
Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala.

P. R. KAUSHIK,  
Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government,  
Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments.

**IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT**

The 5th May, 1994

No. 5355/75/1/L.—Whereas the land described in Haryana Government Gazette notification number 4619/75/1-L, dated 17th May, 1993 issued under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 has been declared to be needed at the public expense for a public purpose namely for Extension of Dulehra Distributory from RD 154000 to RD 157500 tail taking off at RD 156814 tail Bhalaut sub-branch in village Dariyapur, Tehsil Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak.

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 the Governor of Haryana hereby directed the land Acquisition Officer, P. W. D., Irrigation Department, Ambala to take order for the acquisition of land described in the specification appended to declaration published with aforesaid notification.

**SPECIFICATION**

District	Tehsil	Village	Hadbast number	Area in acres	
Rohtak	Bahadurgarh	Dariyapur	73	4.42	A strip of land measuring 3500 feet length and varying in width passing through full part Killa numbers below lying in the direction from East to West and North to South-West.

By Order of Governor of Haryana.

I. J. JUNEJA,  
Superintending Engineer,  
Yamuna Water Services Circle,  
Rohtak,